

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.        | F                    | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |  |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/724,116             | 0/724,116 12/01/2003 |             | Rahul Magoon         | 26169-103-401           | 9927             |  |
| 29899                  | 7590                 | 01/11/2006  |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |  |
| WILLIAM                |                      |             | BAYARD, EMMANUEL     |                         |                  |  |
| 3119 TURN<br>JAMUL, C. |                      |             |                      | ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER   |                  |  |
| <b>, .</b>             |                      |             |                      | 2638                    |                  |  |
|                        |                      |             |                      | DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006 |                  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  |  | Application No.                  | Applicant(s)           |        |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|----------------------------------|------------------------|--------|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | 065 - 4 - 4' - 11 0 0 1 1 1 1 1 1  | 10/724,116                       | MAGOON ET AL.          |        |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Office Action Summary  | Examiner                         | Art Unit               |        |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Emmanuel Bayard                  | 2638                   |        |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) 🛛   | Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Oc  | ctober 2005.                     |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  | This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| ,  | Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is    |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| • -  | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.                          |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4)🖂  | 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-28</u> is/are pending in the application.  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5)🛛  | 5) Claim(s) 28 is/are allowed.   |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠  | ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-27</u> is/are rejected.  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7)   | Claim(s) is/are objected to.   |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8)□  | Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or   | election requirement.            |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Applicati  | on Papers  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.   |  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10)  | The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce  | epted or b) objected to by the E | xaminer.               |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.   |  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority u   | ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:   |  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No                                 |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage              |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.   |  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachmen  | t/e)   |                                  |                        |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| _  | e of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) Interview Summary             | (PTO-413)              |        |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2) Notic   | e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Da              | te                     |        |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date   | 5)  Notice of Informal Pa        | atent Application (PTC | D-152) |  |  |  |  |  |

Art Unit: 2638

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

This is in response to amendment filed on 10/14/05 in which claims 1-27 are pending. The applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are persuasive therefore this case is made final.

### Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual-or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-27 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1-27 of U. S. Patent No. 6,658,066 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: although the conflicting claims are not identical, the claims in the patent encompass the claims in the application.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

## Allowable Subject Matter

- 3. Claim 28 is allowed over the prior art of record.
- 4. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: adjusting) the phase difference between the first and second modulator signal based upon the filtered, detected phase difference to a phase difference value equal to ninety degrees divided by a modulator multiplier value for quadrature sub-harmonic modulation of the quadrature amplitude modulated signal.

#### Conclusion

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- Lampe U.S. Patent No 5,313,173 teaches a quadrature modulated PLL.
- Inoue et al U.S. Patent no 6,198,763 B1 teaches a transmitter and receiver for spread spectrum.
- Blom et al U.S. Patent no 6,026,307 teaches an arrangement in a communication system.
- 6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Art Unit: 2638

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Emmanuel Bayard whose telephone number is 571 272.

3016. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:Am-4:30PM)

Alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vanderpuye Kenneth can be reached on 571 272 3078. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Emmanuel Bayard Primary Examiner Art Unit 2638

1/6/06

EMMANUEL BAYARD